

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Non-Final Office Action mailed Dec. 7, 2005 ("Office Action"), the Examiner considered claims 1 – 8. Claims 1 - 8 stand rejected. Claims 1-8 have been amended, and new claims 9-30 have been added. No new matter has been added. For the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner allow all the pending claims.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

Claims 3 - 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,073,165 to Narasimhan et al. ("*Narasimhan*").

With respect to claim 3, the Applicants assert that it is patentable over *Narasimhan* because *Narasimhan* fails to disclose at least the following elements recited in claim 3: (i) "obtaining new email events from an email database", (ii) "receiving information corresponding to the new email events from the client computer system", and (iii) "storing the information corresponding to the new email events in a database."

With respect to the "obtaining" element, the Applicants assert that *Narasimhan* fails to disclose "obtaining new email events" (i.e., nowhere in *Narasimhan* is it disclosed to obtain "new email events"). The Examiner seems to concede this point because the Examiner uses U.S. Pat. No. 6,510,455 to *Chen* et al. rather than *Narasimhan* to reject a similar "obtaining" element present in claim 1. For at least the reasons provided below with respect to claim 1, the Applicants assert that *Chen* also fails to disclose the "obtaining" element in claim 3.

With respect to the "receiving" element, the Examiner asserts on page 3 of the Office Action that this element is disclosed by *Narasimhan* at col. 4, lns. 6-11, and col. 6, lns. 11-21 and 40-56. Those portions of *Narasimhan* disclose an "e-mail header", "status notifications", and an "original computer message" respectively; however, none of these are "information corresponding to the new email events from the client computer system" where those "email events" are obtained from an "email database".

With respect to the "storing" element, the Examiner asserts that the portions of *Narasimhan* specified earlier also disclose the "storing element". However, those portions of

Narasimhan do not disclose “storing the information corresponding to the new email events in a database” where those “email events” are obtained from an “email database”.

For at least the foregoing reasons, the Applicants respectfully request allowance of claim 3.

Claim 4 includes elements similar to those discussed earlier with respect to claim 3 and thus is patentable over *Narasimhan* for at least the reasons provided for claim 3.

With respect to claim 5, the Applicants assert that it is patentable over *Narasimhan* because *Narasimhan* fails to disclose at least “selecting at least one transfer protocol for the email data based on the examination” as recited in claim 5. On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that this element is disclosed in *Narasimhan* at col. 5, lns. 42-49, col. 6, lns. 40-56, and col. 7, lns. 39-45. Those portions of *Narasimhan* disclose at most that the “account information” can contain the address of the “destination server”, however, those portions do not disclose that the “filter criteria” of *Narasimhan* contains the transfer protocols to be used, and certainly do not disclose “selecting at least one transfer protocol for the email data based on the examination” as recited in claim 5. For at least those reasons, the Applicants respectfully request allowance of claim 5.

Claim 6 includes elements similar to those discussed earlier with respect to claim 5 and thus is patentable over *Narasimhan* for at least the reasons provided for claim 5.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

(a) Claims 1 and 2

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,510,455 to Chen et al. (“*Chen*”), in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,118,856 to Paarsmarkt et al. (“*Paarsmarkt*”), *Narasimhan*, and U.S. Pat. No. 6,757,712 to Bastian et al. (“*Bastian*”).

The Applicants assert that claim 1 is patentable over the proposed combination of *Chen*, *Paarsmarkt*, *Narasimhan*, and *Bastian* because they fail, either singly or together, to disclose or suggest at least the following elements recited in claim 1: (i) “obtaining new email events from an email database after the start criteria have been met”, or (ii) “forwarding information corresponding to the new email events via a computer network to a database”.

With respect to the “obtaining” element, the Examiner asserts on page 5 of the Office Action that this element is disclosed by *Chen* at col. 6, lns. 25-52. However, this portion of *Chen* discloses unpacketizing a message to obtain an email but does not disclose or suggest obtaining “email events”. Applicants’ specification provides an example of “email events” as including, e.g., “transaction information”. (Applicants’ specification at pg. 9, lns. 18-19).

With respect to the “forwarding” element, the Examiner concedes that *Chen* fails to disclose or suggest this element; however, the Examiner asserts that *Paarsmarkt*, *Narasimhan*, and *Bastian* together disclose this element. *Paarsmarkt* discloses forwarding “email or portion thereof”, however, a portion of an email is not “email events” nor does the email portion correspond to the “email events”. (*Paarsmarkt* at col. 2, lns. 2-4). The other cited prior art references (i.e., *Narasimhan* and *Bastian*) do not cure these deficiencies because they also fail to disclose or suggest “email events” and also “forwarding information corresponding to the new email events via a computer network to a database” as recited in claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons, the Applicants respectfully request allowance of claim 1.

Claim 2 includes elements similar to those discussed earlier with respect to claim 1 and thus is patentable over the proposed combination for at least the reasons provided for claim 1.

(b) Claims 7 and 8

Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Narasimhan* in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,138,146 to Moon et al. (“*Moon*”) and *Bastian*.

The Applicants assert that claim 7 is patentable over the proposed combination of *Narasimhan*, *Moon*, and *Bastian* because they fail, either singly or together, to disclose or suggest at least the following elements recited in claim 7: (i) “generating receipt data identifying the email data that should not be forwarded”, and (ii) “forwarding the receipt data via a computer network to a database”.

With respect to the “generating” element, the Applicants assert that the proposed combination does not disclose or suggest “receipt data”. *Narasimhan* discloses “[s]tatus notifications . . . reporting the filtered messages that were forwarded.” (See, e.g., *Narasimhan* at col. 6, lns. 15-18). The “status notifications” of *Narasimhan* differ from “receipt data” because

the “status notifications” refer to the forward/transfer of data rather than its receipt. The other cited prior art references fail to cure this deficiency because, e.g., *Moon* discloses transmitting the entire email rather than a “receipt data”. (See, e.g., *Moon* at col. 2, lns. 37-40).

With respect to the “forwarding” element, the Applicants assert that the proposed combination does not disclose or suggest “forwarding the receipt data . . . to a database” as recited in claim 7. *Narasimhan* discloses that the “status notifications” are sent to the “source server 103”, but the “source server 103” is not a “database”. (See, e.g., *Narasimhan* at col. 6, lns. 15-17). The other cited prior art references fail to cure this because, e.g., *Moon* discloses sending the “retrieved electronic mail back to the server” (rather than a database) if retrieved electronic mail does not meet certain criteria. (See, e.g., *Moon* at col. 2, lns. 37-40).

For at least the foregoing reasons, the Applicants respectfully request allowance of claim 7.

Claim 8 includes elements similar to those discussed earlier with respect to claim 7 and thus is patentable over the proposed combination for at least the reasons provided for claim 7.

New Claims

The Applicants assert that new claims 9 and 10 are patentable over the cited prior art references. New claim 9 depends from claim 1. Thus, claim 9 is patentable for at least the reasons provided earlier with respect to claim 1. In addition, claim 9 is patentable over the cited prior art reference because these references, either singly or together, do not disclose or suggest at least the following elements: “email events”, a firewall, initiating the forwarding of information from within the firewall, a computer network that uses the HTTP port, the SSL port, or the SMTP port on the firewall, and a database on a server outside the firewall that uses an authentication technique. Support for claim 9 is provided in Applicants’ specification at, e.g., pg. 6, lns. 15-20; and pg. 12, ln. 27 to pg. 13, ln. 2. Claim 10 depends from claim 9 and thus is patentable for at least the reasons provided with respect to claim 9.

New claims 11 and 12 include elements similar to those discussed with respect to claims 9 and 10. Thus, for at least the reasons provided earlier with respect to claims 9 and 10, the Applicants assert that claims 11 and 12 are patentable over the cited prior art references.

New claim 13 depends from claim 3. Thus, claim 13 is patentable over *Narasimhan* for at least the reasons provided earlier with respect to claim 3. In addition, claim 13 is patentable over *Narasimhan* because it does not disclose at least the following elements recited in claim 13: a firewall, a communication channel that uses the HTTP port, the SSL port, or the SMTP port on the firewall, and a database on a server outside the firewall that uses an authentication technique. In addition, the Applicants assert that the “determining” element and the “downloading” element recited in claim 14 is not disclosed in *Narasimhan* and thus that claim is also patentable. Support for claim 14 is provided in Applicants’ specification at, e.g., pg. 12, lns. 7-17.

New claims 15 and 16 include elements similar to those discussed with respect to claims 13 and 14. Thus, for at least the reasons provided earlier with respect to claims 13 and 14, the Applicants assert that claims 15 and 16 are patentable over *Narasimhan*.

New claims 17 and 18 depends from claim 5. Thus, these claims are patentable over *Narasimhan* for at least the reasons provided earlier with respect to claim 5. In addition, claim 17 is patentable over *Narasimhan* because it does not disclose at least the following elements recited in claim 17: a firewall, initiating the forwarding of email data from within the firewall, a computer network that uses the HTTP port, the SSL port, or the SMTP port on the firewall, and a database on a server outside the firewall that uses an authentication technique. Similarly, claim 18 is patentable over *Narasimhan* for at least the additional reason that *Narasimhan* does not disclose forwarding a receipt confirmation message if the examination shows that the email data includes confidential information. Support for claim 18 is provided in Applicants’ specification at, e.g., pg. 16, lns. 20-22.

New claim 19 includes elements similar to those discussed with respect to claims 17. Thus, for at least the reasons provided earlier with respect to claims 17, the Applicants assert that claim 19 is patentable over *Narasimhan*.

New claim 20 depends from claim 7. Thus, claim 20 is patentable for at least the reasons provided earlier with respect to claim 7. In addition, claim 20 is patentable over the cited prior art reference because these references, either singly or together, do not disclose or suggest at least the following elements: “receipt data”, a firewall, initiating the forwarding of the receipt data from within the firewall, a computer network that uses the HTTP port, the SSL port, or the

SMTP port on the firewall, and a database on a server outside the firewall that uses an authentication technique.

New claim 21 includes elements similar to those discussed with respect to claim 20. Thus, for at least the reasons provided earlier with respect to claim 20, the Applicants assert that claim 21 is also patentable over the cited prior art references.

New claim 22 is patentable over the cited prior art reference because these references, either singly or together, do not disclose or suggest at least the following elements: a firewall that includes a HTTP port, a SSL port, or a SMTP port; a client configuration engine to initiate a forwarding functionality from within the firewall when a start criteria is satisfied; a format converter to convert the email data from a first format to a second format; and a communication channel that couples the first computer to the second computer using the HTTP port, the SMTP port, or the SSL port. New claims 23 to 30 depend from claim 22 and thus are patentable over the cited prior art references for at least the reasons provided with respect to claim 22.

CONCLUSION

On the basis of the above remarks, reconsideration and allowance of all the pending claims is believed to be warranted and such action is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions or comments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the number listed below. The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1847.

Respectfully Submitted,

By: Thomas George
Thomas George
Registration No. 45,740
MANATT, PHELPS & PHILLIPS LLP
1001 Page Mill Road, Building 2
Palo Alto, California 94304
650-812-1327 Telephone
650-213-0286 Facsimile

20153011.1